

**MINUTES OF  
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 22, 2015**

PRESENT: Peter F. Murphy, Springfield District  
Frank A. de la Fe, Hunter Mill District  
Julie Strandlie, Mason District  
James R. Hart, Commissioner At-Large  
Ellen J. Hurley, Braddock District  
John C. Ulfelder, Dranesville District  
John L. Litzenberger, Jr., Sully District  
Janyce N. Hedetniemi, Commissioner At-Large

ABSENT: James T. Migliaccio, Lee District  
Earl L. Flanagan, Mount Vernon District  
Kenneth A. Lawrence, Providence District  
Timothy J. Sargeant, Commissioner At-Large

//

The meeting was called to order at 8:21 p.m. by Chairman Peter F. Murphy in the Board Auditorium of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

Commissioner Hart announced that the Planning Commission's Environment Committee would meet at 7:00 p.m. in the Board Conference Room of the Fairfax County Government Center on the following dates:

- May 20 – Electric Vehicle Charging Station Infrastructure
- June 24 – Building Energy Policy

He added that everyone was welcome to attend.

//

On behalf of the Commission, Chairman Murphy acknowledged the Planning Commission staff for their work, in recognition of Administrative Professionals Appreciation Day.

//

RZ/FDP 2014-MA-014 – FP COLUMBIA PIKE, LLC

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I MAKE A MOTION TO DEFER RZ/FDP 2014-MA-014, FP COLUMBIA PIKE, LLC, TO JUNE 18TH, 2015.

Commissioners Litzenberger and Hedetniemi: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Litzenberger and Ms. Hedetniemi. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to defer the applications, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

The motion carried by a vote of 8-0. Commissioners Flanagan, Lawrence, Migliaccio, and Sargeant were absent from the meeting.

//

PCA/FDPA 2005-PR-041-04 – ESKRIDGE (E & A) LLC

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman, this is the Eskridge case. I previously announced my intent to defer a combined proffered condition amendment/final development plan amendment application in the Providence district, due to an affidavit problem. The case was set for public hearing this evening. We're going to have to change the date that was previously announced, but we're still going to defer it. I therefore MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE PUBLIC HEARINGS ON PCA 2005-PR-041-04 AND FDPA 2005-PR-041-04, IN THE NAME OF ESKRIDGE (E & A) LLC, TO A NEW DATE OF MAY 6, 2015.

Commissioner de la Fe: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. de la Fe. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to defer the applications, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

The motion carried by a vote of 8-0. Commissioners Flanagan, Lawrence, Migliaccio, and Sargeant were absent from the meeting.

//

PFM AMENDMENT (UNDERGROUND DETENTION FACILITIES) (Decision Only) (The public hearing on this application was held on March 25, 2015.)

Commissioner Hart: After transportation, stormwater management may be the issue most frequently raised by citizens on development applications. On March 25, we had a public hearing on a proposed Public Facilities Manual Amendment On Use of Underground Detention Facilities In Residential and Mixed Use Developments, and deferred decision, for additional information from staff, which you should have received, under cover of Mr. Shirey's memo of April 9th. I believe we are ready to move forward, and will have three motions. I wanted to thank the citizens who spoke and/or submitted comments on this topic. I also wanted to thank the Engineering Standards Review Committee and county staff, Jan Leavitt, Paul Shirey, Thakur

Dhakal and John Matusik for their fine work and outreach efforts, including multiple presentations to the ESRC and a presentation to the Environment Committee. I also want to thank Chris Costa from the County Attorney's Office for his assistance. The Planning Commission has, with suggestions from Commissioner de la Fe, hoped to streamline some of the land use process, including elimination of the need for waivers and modifications which are routinely or always granted. It is a rare application on a big case that does not require multiple waivers. For example, the waiver for underground stormwater detention was granted the last 37 times. Staff and the ESRC are recommending approval of Option 2, with which I concur. We had another issue raised by Supervisor Smyth, which staff and the ESRC also have considered subsequent to the public hearing. While I tend to agree that the issue of citizen complaints is not directly germane to the question of underground detention waivers, I believe it may be time to review the overall problem of citizen complaints about stormwater management, and how they are best considered in the land use process. I will suggest a recommendation accordingly. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I first MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT THEY APPROVE OPTION TWO OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT, AS SET FORTH IN THE STAFF REPORT DATED FEBRUARY 17, 2015, WITH STAFF'S RECOMMENDED EDITORIAL CHANGE TO PFM SECTION 6-0303.6C, DATED APRIL 9, 2015.

Commissioners Litzenberger and Ulfelder: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Litzenberger and Mr. Ulfelder. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion on the Plan Amendment, Underground Detention Facilities, as articulated by Mr. Hart, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Hart: Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT THE AMENDMENT SHALL BECOME EFFECTIVE AT 12:01 A.M. ON JUNE 3, 2015.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Ulfelder. Is there a discussion of that motion? All those in favor of the motion, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Hart: Finally, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT STAFF BE DIRECTED TO REVIEW THE ISSUE OF CITIZEN STORMWATER COMPLAINTS RELATED TO LAND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AND MAKE APPROPRIATE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AS TO HOW BEST TO

CONSIDER THIS INFORMATION AND INCORPORATE IT INTO THE DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION AND PLAN REVIEW PROCESSES IN FAIRFAX COUNTY.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Ulfelder. Is there a discussion of that motion? All those in favor of the motion, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner de la Fe: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Yes, Mr. de la Fe.

Commissioner de la Fe: Mr. Chairman, could I be shown as abstaining on all those three, because even though I followed everything, I was absent from that particular public hearing and I was not able to watch the tape.

Chairman Murphy: Okay.

The motion carried by a vote of 7-0-1. Commissioner de la Fe abstained from the vote. Commissioners Flanagan, Lawrence, Migliaccio, Sargeant were absent from the meeting.

//

#### ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Hart established the following order of the agenda:

1. ST09-III-UP1 (B) (RESTON MASTER PLAN SPECIAL STUDY PHASE II)

This agenda was accepted without objection.

//

ST09-III-UP1 (B) (RESTON MASTER PLAN SPECIAL STUDY PHASE II) – Concerns approximately 8,400 acres of land (inclusive of roads), generally located approximately 20 miles west of Washington DC, seven miles west of Tysons and six miles east of Washington Dulles International Airport. The study area is within the Hunter Mill Supervisor District and shown on the adopted Comprehensive Plan maps as Residential Planned Community (RPC) and it is bisected by the Dulles Airport Access Road (DAAR) and extends as far as Route 7 on the north and is bounded on the north, east and south by low density residential

bounded on the north, east and south by low density residential neighborhoods that are accessible from Route 7, Hunter Mill Road and Lawyers Road. The Plan Amendment proposes to update Comprehensive Plan guidance for the community of Reston and several small areas adjacent to Reston. The guidance is applicable to Reston's Transit Station Areas (Wiehle-Reston East, Reston Town Center and Herndon), residential neighborhoods, Village Centers (Hunters Woods, South Lakes, Tall Oaks, North Point and Lake Anne) and several non-residential areas located within the residential neighborhoods. The Plan Amendment for Phase 2 retains and integrates the community-wide Reston Vision and Planning Principles and Reston Transit Station Areas guidance previously adopted (February 11, 2014) as part of the Comprehensive Plan amendment for Phase 1 of the Reston study (ST09-III-UP1(A)). It also retains the recommendations previously adopted (December 2, 2014) as part of the Lake Anne Village Center/Reston Crescent Plan Amendment (2013-III-UP1). The retention and integration of previously adopted guidance necessitates minor editorial changes in some instances. As a part of this proposed update, planning guidance for Reston will be consolidated into one location within Fairfax County's Comprehensive Plan. The Area Plan III volume will include a new Reston section for ease of use and improved accessibility. The proposed Reston Plan guidance will also reference pertinent Comprehensive Plan guidance from the Upper Potomac Planning District and the UP5 Community Planning Sector, the county planning geographies in which Reston resides. Furthermore, the consolidation of Reston's Comprehensive Plan guidance into a single section requires editorial changes in the UP4, UP5 and UP7 Community Planning Sectors along with editorial changes within the Upper Potomac Planning District and Volume III of the Area Plans to align facts and figures with the changes proposed within the Reston guidance. This area has been the subject of Phase 2 of the Reston Master Plan Special Study (RMPSS), a special planning study initiated to evaluate Plan guidance for the planned community of Reston. Specifically, the Plan amendment for Phase 2 proposes an updated Reston Plan map that merges the Land Use Plan, the Community Facilities Plan and presents updated land use designations that further community desires to maintain established residential neighborhoods. In addition, it communicates expectations for future development in Reston by providing structured Reston specific processes and more rigorous criteria for the consideration of single-family and multi-family redevelopment proposals. Moreover, it establishes general guidance for the vision and expectations for redevelopment of the Village Centers. Lastly, it maintains the existing characters of Reston's convenience center and commercial area along Baron Cameron Avenue between

Bennington Woods Road to the west, Reston Parkway to the east and Stevenage Road to the north. Reston's growth is planned to occur in Reston's Transit Station Areas (the areas along the Dulles Toll Road, generally within walking distance of planned or existing Metrorail stations) and Village Centers. All other areas of Reston (residential neighborhoods and Convenience Centers) are generally planned to remain as currently built. The Reston Neighborhoods section provides guidance to maintain the established residential neighborhoods. Residential land use categories have been expanded from their current 3 broad categories (low, medium, and high density) to 5 categories to more closely reflect what has been built in the community, with the desired result of maintaining established neighborhoods. The proposed residential categories are Low-density Single-family (0-4 DU/AC), Medium-Density Single-Family (5-12 DU/AC), Low-Density Multi-Family (13-20 DU/AC), Medium-Density Multi-Family (21-50 DU/AC), and High-Density Multi-Family (greater than 50 DU/AC). Existing Countywide Comprehensive Plan land use categories are applied to the few areas in Reston not included in the RPC Plan designation. In the event of residential neighborhood redevelopment requests, more stringent redevelopment criteria have been established that go beyond the County-wide criteria. Other proposed land use designations include Office, Retail, Village Center Mixed Use; Public Facilities, Government and Institutional; and Parks, Recreation and Open Space. Reston's Village Centers are planned to reflect the land uses that currently exist, with the exception of Lake Anne Village Center which currently has detailed planning guidance to guide future redevelopment. This guidance will be retained. A general vision and guidelines for redevelopment is established for any future Village Center redevelopment proposals. Currently the Village Centers have neither a vision, nor redevelopment guidelines to create a common set of expectations for residents, landowners and businesses regarding future changes. The proposed general vision establishes the basic elements necessary for any redevelopment proposal in any Village Center. The guidelines for redevelopment establish the process required of any redevelopment proposal as well as detailed planning objectives. Housing choices are encouraged to maintain Reston's diverse age, family status and income structure. These choices include different unit types, architectural styles, ownership patterns, senior housing and universally designed housing. Housing affordability has been increased beyond County-wide policies to recommend 12% or more Affordable Dwelling Units or Workforce Dwelling Units for any residential development or redevelopment in Reston. A higher percentage is expected in the Transit Station Areas, along with a contribution to affordable housing by non-residential development.

All Public Parks, Private Recreation, and Private Open Space are now reflected in Reston's Land Use Map and are further detailed on the Parks and Open Space map. More parks and recreation facilities and open space are included in the Reston Land Use Map. Existing trails are proposed to be shown within the Reston Plan. Reston's two golf courses are planned to remain. Transportation recommendations expand and improve pedestrian and bicyclist mobility and infrastructure. The majority of transportation recommendations were adopted with the Plan Amendment for Phase 1, and thus, are advanced in the Plan Amendment for Phase 2.

Commissioner de la Fe announced his intent to defer the decision on this application at the end of the public hearing.

Faheem Darab, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that staff recommended adoption of application ST09-III-UP1 (B).

Chairman Murphy called the first listed speaker and recited the rules for testimony.

Lynn Brown, 12604 Bridoon Lane, Reston, expressed concern regarding the proposed grade-separated interchange at the intersection of Sunrise Valley Drive and the Fairfax County Parkway. In addition she requested the following:

- that Polo Fields be recognized on the Reston plan map;
- that the southern boundary of the Herndon Transit Station Area be changed to Fox Mill Road;
- that documents detailing the issues at the Fairfax County Parkway/Sunrise Valley interchange, potential solutions, and why the decision for a grade separated interchange be provided; and
- that Polo Fields representatives in local government and the Reston Association communicate with residents on the issues impacting them, particularly with regard to the grade-separated interchange.

Commissioner de la Fe recalled having received testimony from Polo Fields representatives during Phase I of the Reston Master Plan study and asked staff if the residents from that community had participated in the meetings. Fred Selden, Director, DPZ, confirmed that representatives from Polo Fields had attended several of the meetings and engaged in the process.

Sherri Herbert, representing Bentana Woods Cluster Association, 1607 Park Overlook Drive, Reston, noted that although several retailers had occupied the space at Tall Oaks Village Center, none of them ever quite fit into the surrounding area. She acknowledged that there were new

developers with innovative ideas, but said that the village center should maintain its current character and not be changed into a convenience center.

John Eidson, 2230 Halter Lane, Reston, spoke in opposition to the amendment, expressing concern that he might lose his house because of the proposed interchange at Sunrise Valley Drive and the Fairfax County Parkway. He added that significant monies had already been spent on the subject intersection, with improvement. He also noted that while the value of his home could increase with the coming of the Metrorail Silver Line, the proposed interchange would negate that increase.

Brian Winterhalter, Esquire, representing Cooley LLP, 11951 Freedom Drive, Reston, noted that the proposal appeared to recommend down-planning of areas outside the transit station areas (TSA) while requiring plan amendments for proposed redevelopment. He stated that this was an inappropriate approach to planning in Reston, adding that any community should be given an opportunity to grow in an appropriate manner. He also stated that under the current Fairfax Forward program, there seemed to be no way to review an individual plan amendment. He stated that with this amendment, there was an opportunity to identify and articulate the vision, conditions and development objectives for certain areas of Reston; to put into the Comprehensive Plan; and adopt them as part of this plan amendment, rather than moving forward with a down-planning and future plan amendment for every redevelopment proposal.

Patricia Nicoson, 11302 Fairway Drive, Reston, expressed concern that there was no specified vision for the village centers and added that many other areas in Reston appeared to be downzoned. She noted that legal issues could arise from the proposed downzoning, which would delay development. She also noted concern with regard to the length of the plan amendment process and said that current staff might be inadequate to deal with the potential number of amendments. She pointed out that the Baron Cameron retail area was a Gateway site for Reston and should have a clear vision that would see it redeveloped with mixed use. In addition, Ms. Nicoson said that some of the neighborhoods in Reston were almost 40 years old and would benefit by updated, mixed-use redevelopment that included moderate housing and affordable dwelling units. (A copy of Ms. Nicoson's statement is in the date file.)

Kenneth Knueven, Member, Board of Directors, representing the Reston Association (RA), 11432 Waterview Cluster, Reston, suggested that the "convenience center" designation for the old Reston Visitor and Sales Center property be removed from the Land Use Map of the north section of Reston. He also noted that maintaining a "convenience center" designation for the Lake Newport property, as recommended by staff, would be contrary to the Plan text and, therefore, Lake Newport should be stricken from the list of convenience centers. In addition, he stated that Tall Oaks had not functioned as a true "village center" for some time and likely would not be redeveloped in accordance with the Plan's vision for a village center; however, he stated that it should retain a mix of residential, retail, office, community plaza, and personal service uses more comparable to a convenience center than village center. Hence, Tall Oaks should no longer be listed or treated as a "village center." Mr. Knueven stated that the third bullet of the Plan text under "Transition to Existing Uses," must be modified in order to protect the neighborhoods surrounding village centers, pointing out that developers should only be permitted to expand a center by proving that it was essential to do so. He noted that while the RA strongly supported the Baron Cameron Community Retail Area recommendations, the association had



concerns about correlating text under the Option for Mixed-Use Development, pointing out that this area was not an extension of the Reston Town Center urban area. He further added that the areas to the north of Baron Cameron should maintain their suburban character and density, since they were too far removed from the grid of streets and transit facilities to support urban intensities and density. (A copy of Mr. Knueven's statement is in the date file.)

Eve Thompson, 11400 Washington Plaza West, Reston, stated that the staff report referenced urban design throughout Reston, noting that the staff report discussed urban design principles for all areas of Reston except the village centers and the transit station areas. She pointed out that it was only the village centers and TSAs which were planned as urban environments and that the design principles for the rest of Reston should be relabeled "Community Design Principles." She added that the same change should be made on page 20 of the staff report to read "Community Design and Placemaking," rather than "Urban Design and Placemaking." (A copy of Ms. Thompson's statement is in the date file.)

Jeffrey Thomas, 11310 Myrtle Lane, Reston, pointed out that while some of Reston's recreational facilities might have been run by the Fairfax County Park Authority, the majority were funded and operated by the Reston Association, the Reston Community Center, and the Reston Town Center Association. He added that the facilities and programs provided by those groups would need to grow in proportion to the growth in population associated with redevelopment. (A copy of Mr. Thomas's statement is in the date file.)

Ellen Graves, 11710 Dry River Court, Reston, noted that edits should be made on several pages in the staff report, regarding the protection of natural open space, lakes, and trails. In addition, she noted that text regarding new (re)development should include green space, trees, and to the greatest extent possible, undisturbed natural areas. (A copy of Ms. Graves' statement, with her suggested edits, is in the date file.)

Michael Sanio, 1307 Sawbridge Way, Reston, noted that Reston was founded in 1962 as a sustainable community designed to balance and integrate environmental, economic, health, and social features to maximize the quality of life for its residents. He added that because sustainability principles were so important to the Reston community, they should be added to the plan text. (A copy of Mr. Sanio's statement is in the date file.)

Cate Fulkerson, Chief Executive Officer, Reston Association (RA), 12001 Sunrise Valley Drive, Reston, stated that RA was an integral part of the planned community structure, adding that the Association's Design Review Board and Reston's covenants were linked to the Reston Master Plan. She said that growth would require additional transportation and park facilities and utilities and noted that RA provided many amenities and services normally provided or supported by the County elsewhere. Additionally, she pointed out that the Association owned and maintained four regional stormwater detention lakes and ponds, in addition to maintaining over 55 miles of paved trails, including many in County easements. She stated that these amenities must increase in proportion with the growth and development of our planned community. (A copy of Ms. Fulkerson's statement is in the date file.)

Melanie Whitaker, 1635 Bentana Way, Reston, stated that she did not want to see Tall Oaks Village Center dropped from the list of village centers, noting that a change to a convenience center would not provide adequate services to the community. She also questioned the viability of such a center and requested clarification as to the definition of a convenience center. She added that walking to other nearby village centers would not be feasible because of the distance and pointed out that the village centers were integral to Reston's planning. (A copy of Ms. Whitaker's statement is in the date file.)

Shane Murphy, representing Greater Reston Chamber of Commerce, 1818 Library Street, Reston, expressed concern that Phase II of the Reston Master Planning process might effectively create two Restons, noting that the second phase had no clear vision for future development or revitalization. He added that this proposal represented only what currently existed in Reston and said that it would essentially pause, if not freeze, many new developments. He further stated that future efforts to redevelop in the area would require approval of a future amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, consequently resulting in additional work for county staff. He requested that the Commission review the proposal more closely to better determine which areas of the community were best suited for change and how it could be best managed. (A copy of Mr. Murphy's statement is in the date file.)

Matt Valentini, Vice President, JBG Companies, 11800 Sunrise Valley Drive, Reston, said that while open space was generally good, oftentimes a prescribed percentage had no correlation to the quality of the space. He added that specific targets often limited the ability of a site to create quality open space. Additionally, he recommended that references to stormwater standards be removed, as the language could conflict with existing language in the Fairfax County Zoning Ordinance. He recommended flexibility in the land use consideration and said that quality development, such as townhomes in the transit core, should be considered for every possibility within the community. He noted that the street categories were acceptable; however, he was concerned that follow-on motions might be necessary for their approval, since street standards had not yet been agreed upon by transportation officials. Mr. Valentini further stated that it would be a mistake to require Comprehensive Plan amendments for all redevelopment outside of the TSA, and stated that it would only add more work, time, and cost to an already extensive process. (A copy of Mr. Valentini's statement is in the date file.)

Heidi A. Keusenkothen 10909 Hunt Club Road, Reston, talked about the Hunt Club Clubhouse cemetery on Lake Fairfax Drive, and providing its history in the Reston area. She requested that language be included in the Reston Master Plan to ensure a 500-foot buffer around the cemetery to preserve its cultural integrity, in conjunction with the Hunt Clubhouse. Additionally, she suggested that another indoor pool might be located within the Tall Oaks Village Center.

Heather Greenfield Sheehe representing Hunt Club Cluster Association, 1421 Green Run Lane, Reston, echoed Ms. Keusenkothen's remarks regarding the Hunt Club Clubhouse cemetery and provided a more detailed history of the site.

Sara McAlpine, 1637 Bentana Way, Reston, requested full adherence to the recommendation for Tall Oaks Village Center, as noted in Appendix A: Recommended Plan Text of the Reston Plan, *Tall Oaks Village Center*, on pages 62 and 63 of the staff report.

Mark Malcolm, 12824 Tournament Drive, Reston, noted erroneous items listed in the plan and requested that the Sunrise Valley Wetland Nature Park be correctly identified on the Comprehensive Plan as private property. He also asked, however, that the Commission recommend to the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors that it acquire the property for public use.

Robert Whitfield 1538 Woodcrest Drive, Reston, stated that the Reston Master Plan process lacked information and financial planning. He added that before moving forward with this proposal, a more detailed analysis on Phase I would be needed to better understand the total cost of any (re)development.

Robert E. Simon, Founder of Reston, 11400 Washington Plaza West, Reston, stated that the existing village centers and town plazas should be redeveloped with high-density mixed use. He suggested that art be integrated into the development and made note of the Initiative for Public Art - Reston (IPAR), a group of civic leaders representing Reston's key community organizations. He further noted that Reston could distinguish itself by offering incentives to eminent architects who could redefine the architectural look and character of Reston.

Commissioner Hart referenced Section 15.2-2223A of the *Virginia Code*, which required the preparation and adoption of a comprehensive plan to guide the growth and development of a community. He cautioned against being too specific and suggested allowing for some flexibility in the planning process to not only minimize the workload, but also to simplify the process. Additionally, he pointed out that the *Schools* paragraph on page 82 of the staff report was inappropriate and should be omitted from the staff report, stating that school boundary issues were outside of the Planning Commission's purview. Also, he noted that the language regarding green buildings was duplicative and suggested that unless there was a significant difference in Reston's policy, the countywide green building policy should be referenced.

Commissioner de la Fe assured the speakers that he had heard their concerns, particularly with regard to Tall Oaks Village Center. He noted that there were guidelines in place for village centers and that a plan amendment should not be required for a redevelopment. He added, however, that there would still be an opportunity for a comprehensive public process under the PRC plan.

There were no further comments or questions from the Commission and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner de la Fe for action on this case.

//

Chairman Murphy: Public hearing is closed; Mr. de la Fe.

Commissioner de la Fe: Yes, as I stated, we – we are going to defer this decision and I don't have it in front of me. What date did we decide to initially defer it to?

Faheem Darab, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning: I think it was May 13<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner de la Fe: To May 13<sup>th</sup>? So, I MOVE THAT WE DEFER THE DECISION ON ST09-III-UP-B [*sic*], THE RESTON MASTER PLAN, PHASE II, TO A DATE CERTAIN OF MAY 13<sup>TH</sup>, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.

Commissioner Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to defer decision only on out-of-turn plan amendment ST09-III-UP1 (B), with the record remaining open for written comments or email comments, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

The motion carried by a vote of 8-0. Commissioners Flanagan, Lawrence, Migliaccio, and Sargeant were absent from the meeting.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 10:05 p.m.  
Peter F. Murphy, Chairman  
Janet R. Hall, Secretary

Audio and video recordings of this meeting are available at the Planning Commission Office, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 330, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

Minutes by: Jeanette Nord

Approved on: September 17, 2015

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John W. Cooper, Clerk to the  
Fairfax County Planning Commission